



Chapter 11 – Performance Management

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REFERENCES.....	11-3
PURPOSE.....	11-5
APPLICABILITY.....	11-5
POLICY.....	11-5
RESPONSIBILITIES.....	11-6
THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS.....	11-13
PERFORMANCE PLANNING.....	11-15
MANAGING PERFORMANCE.....	11-22
DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE.....	11-26
YEAR-END PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.....	11-30
INTERIM PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PERIOD.....	11-41
SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.....	11-43

CHALLENGING THE EVALUATION OF RECORD.....	11-46
APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES....	11-51
APPENDIX B: QUICK REFERENCE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SPECIAL SITUATIONS.....	11-57
GLOSSARY.....	11-62

REFERENCES

- (a) Section 1601-1614 of Title 10, United States Code (USC)
- (b) DoD Instruction 1400.25-V2011, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management," January 15, 2010.
- (c) DoD Directive 5124.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness USD(P&R))," June 23, 2008
- (d) DoD Directive 5143.01, "Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I))," November 23, 2005
- (e) DoD Instruction 1400.25, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System," November 25, 1996
- (f) DoD Directive 1400.35, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS)," September 24, 2007
- (g) Executive Order 13526, "Classified National Security Information," December 9, 2009
- (h) Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Statement of Strategic Intent, "Strategic Intent for the Defense Intelligence Enterprise," August 2007
- (i) Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code (USC)
- (j) Intelligence Community Directive Number 651, "Human Capital Performance Management for the Intelligence Community Civilian Workforce," November 28, 2007
- (k) Director of National Intelligence Strategy, "The National Intelligence Strategy of the United States of America," October 2005
- (l) SECNAV Instruction 12900.2a, "Defense Civilian Intelligence System", February 8, 2013

(m) Part 531.405, Subpart D of Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations

(n) Title 38, United States Code

1. **PURPOSE.** To establish Naval Intelligence performance management policy, assign responsibilities, and prescribe procedures for civilian employees covered under the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS).

2. **APPLICABILITY.**

2.1. This chapter applies to all Department of Navy (DON) DCIPS employees who have been appointed under section 1601 of reference (a).

2.2. Does not apply to members of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES) or the Defense Intelligence Senior Level (DISL) employees.

2.3. Does not apply to employees covered by the Federal Wage System or equivalent, non-appropriated fund employees, or foreign national employees.

3. **POLICY.** It is Naval Intelligence policy that the DCIPS performance management system shall:

3.1. Ensure the alignment of individual performance objectives to the intelligence goals and objectives of Entities with DON DCIPS positions (EDDPs).

3.2. Ensure ongoing feedback between employees and supervisors on progress toward accomplishment of those objectives.

3.3. Provide a basis for measuring and assigning accountability for individual and organizational performance and accomplishment of those objectives.

3.4. Provide a fair and equitable process for appraising and evaluating DCIPS employee performance within and across the EDDPs, and shall not permit a forced distribution of evaluations.

3.5. Identify the developmental needs of DCIPS employees.

3.6. Be consistent with the merit system principles set forth in chapter 23 of title 5, U.S. Code reference (i).

4. RESPONSIBILITIES.

Performance management has one primary purpose: to achieve organizational results and mission objectives through the effective management of individual and organizational performance. In accordance with DoD Instruction 1400.25, V2011, reference (b), performance management shall be a priority for all Defense Intelligence executives, managers, supervisors, and employees. Performance expectations shall be linked to the Director of National Intelligence Strategy, reference (k), and applicable strategies of the Department of Defense (DoD) and Naval Intelligence. Performance expectations shall cascade from the senior levels of the organization through subordinate managers and supervisors to individual employees. Successful performance management requires commitment to performance planning, measurement, and management practices.

4.1. The Head, Naval Intelligence Activity (NIAH) shall:

4.1.1 Develop, in collaboration with the Director of Intelligence, Headquarters Marine Corps (HQMC) and the Entities with DON DCIPS positions (EDDP), DCIPS policies, procedures, programs, and requirements for the DON DCIPS Community as specified in SECNAV Instruction 12900.2a, "Defense Civilian Intelligence System", February 8, 2013, reference (l).

4.1.2. Establish the performance management program's strategic direction, provide the overall program application, and approve implementing guidance for administration of the DCIPS performance management programs.

4.1.3. Delegate the authority as appropriate, to implement performance management and compliance with performance management policy and procedural guidance within Naval Intelligence.

4.1.4. Exercise responsibility and oversight of DCIPS performance management system.

4.1.5. Serve as the Naval Intelligence Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA) for Naval Intelligence employee performance evaluations, and final decisions regarding employee reconsiderations.

4.1.6. Naval Intelligence Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA) may consist of the Naval Civilian Oversight Board (NCOB) chaired by the NIAH. This group

certifies the appraisal process at the Naval Intelligence level. The Naval Intelligence PM PRA shall:

4.1.6.1. Provide oversight of performance management processes conducted under his or her purview to ensure the consistency of DCIPS performance management practices.

4.1.6.2 Ensure compliance with merit system principles throughout the performance management process.

4.1.6.3 Maintain integrity, consistency, and confidentiality throughout the performance management process.

4.1.6.4. Provide independent review and decision of formal reconsideration requests of evaluation of record when challenged by an employee as outlined in section 12 of this chapter.

4.1.6.5. Review, certify, and release final ratings of record across Naval Intelligence.

4.1.6.6. Serve as the final point of decision for a further and final request for reconsideration and other special situations not resolved at the EDDP level.

4.2. The **Naval Intelligence Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO)** shall:

4.2.1. Oversee the management of the performance management process to ensure the consistency of performance management policies within Naval Intelligence.

4.2.2. Provide executive advice and consultation to the NIAH on the DCIPS Performance Management policies and program.

4.2.3. Ensure alignment of DCIPS policies and procedures with the Naval Intelligence strategic human capital plan and transformation goals.

4.2.4. Ensure implementation of DCIPS performance management and compliance with performance management policy, procedural guidance through reporting requirements, and program evaluation.

4.3. The **Directors of Civilian Human Resources (DCHR)** with DCIPS employees shall:

4.3.1. Serve as the Naval Intelligence advisor for all civilian human resources systems and programs and the primary

point of contact on managing DCIPS programs.

4.3.2. Develop policies governing the design and administration of DON DCIPS performance management consistent with references (a) through (l).

4.3.3. Provide advice and guidance on performance management matters to the Heads of EDDPs in accordance with this chapter and laws, statutes, regulations, and guidance

4.3.4 Ensure the implementation of DCIPS performance management and compliance with performance management policy and procedural guidance.

4.3.5. Ensure compliance with Merit System Principles and prevention of conflicts of interest in the establishments and operation of performance management reviews.

4.4. The **Human Resources Director (HRD)** servicing DCIPS employees shall:

4.4.1. Ensure the execution of DCIPS performance management programs and compliance with DCIPS Policy.

4.4.2. Represent the performance management requirements of EDDPs to the servicing OCHR Operations Center.

4.4.3. Exercise oversight of the DCIPS performance management system for reconsiderations regarding EDDPs employees in accordance with the procedures for administrative reconsideration.

4.4.4. Ensure that the servicing Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR) Operations Center certify personnel actions and process requests for personnel action (RPAs) or entitlements for the Naval Intelligence Community.

4.5. **Heads of Entities with DON DCIPS (EDDP) Positions** shall:

4.5.1. Manage command performance management programs and issue supplemental guidance and operating procedures.

4.5.2. Provide oversight of performance evaluations to ensure the consistency of DCIPS performance management practices within the EDDPs.

4.5.3. Ensure compliance with Merit System Principles in regard to performance management.

4.5.4. Exercise oversight of the DCIPS performance management system for reconsiderations regarding EDDPs employees in accordance with the procedures for administrative reconsideration.

4.6. **EDDP PM PRAs** have the authority to establish its respective PM PRA structure in accordance with annual performance management guidance issued by the NIAH.

4.6.1. The EDDP PM PRA is comprised, when possible, of an individual senior executive or a panel of senior executives and/or equivalent military personnel chaired by an individual that provides leadership, oversight, and enforces policy for all employees under their purview.

4.6.2. The designated person or members serving on a panel should be employees of Naval Intelligence. In some cases, it may not be possible for the entire panel to consist of Naval Intelligence employees. For this reason, the EDDPs may request appropriate personnel from within the Defense Intelligence Community to participate in its EDDP PM PRA panel to provide appropriate levels of expertise. In these circumstances, a Naval Intelligence employee must serve as the chairperson of the panel. Exceptions to the PM PRA structure must be approved by the NIAH. Employees shall be notified of their EDDP PM PRA structure as early as possible, but no later than 90 days prior to the end of the rating cycle. The EDDP PM PRA shall:

4.6.2.1. Monitor the appraisal process and approve ratings at the EDDP level.

4.6.2.2. Ensure compliance with merit system principles as outlined in Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, reference (i).

4.6.2.3. Inform Rating and Reviewing Officials when the Naval Intelligence PM PRA has certified the ratings.

4.6.2.4. Serve as the final point of decision for formal requests for reconsideration and other special situations not resolved at reviewing and rating official level.

4.6.2.5. Oversee the informal reconsideration process for their respective EDDP.

4.6.2.6. Evaluates the Performance Management process annually to identify and document best practices, areas of improvement, and lessons learned.

4.6.2.7. Complete all Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) and Naval Intelligence required annual performance management training.

4.6.2.8. Ensure that all reviewing and rating officials complete USD(I) and Naval Intelligence required performance management training.

4.7. Reviewing Officials serve as the approving official for each individual evaluation of record within their purview. Reviewing officials are responsible and shall be held accountable for ensuring accuracy of the performance management process within the subordinate organizations and units for which they are responsible. This includes but is not limited to ensuring that:

4.7.1. Employees complete all USD(I) and Naval Intelligence required annual performance management training

4.7.2. Performance objectives and Individual Development Plans (IDPs) are in place in accordance within established timelines for all employees.

4.7.3. Subordinate rating officials and supervisors (when the supervisor is not the rating official) are trained in their roles as outlined in DoD Instruction 1400.25, V2011, reference (b).

4.7.4. Subordinate rating officials are providing performance feedback throughout the evaluation period and rating officials have documented at least one midpoint performance review feedback session with each employee.

4.7.5. Subordinate rating officials, when not the immediate supervisor of employees for whom they are the rating official, are maintaining ongoing dialog with the immediate supervisors of those employees regarding employee performance.

4.7.6. All evaluations of record within subordinate organizations and units are completed within Naval Intelligence prescribed timelines.

4.7.7. Performance standards are consistently applied among those rating officials for whom they are the reviewing official.

4.7.8. Subordinate rating officials are executing their responsibilities consistent with merit system principles.

4.7.9. Ensure the subordinate's performance objectives are aligned with the mission and goal of the agency.

4.7.10. Release the ratings to the EDDPs PM PRA.

4.7.11. Ensure that final ratings of record are approved in the PAA only after they receive notice from the EDDPs PM PRA that the Naval Intelligence PM PRA has certified the ratings as final.

4.8. **Rating Officials** are responsible and shall be held accountable for effectively managing the performance of assigned employees. This includes but is not limited to:

4.8.1. Executing the requirements of this Chapter in accordance with the merit system principles set forth in Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, reference (i).

4.8.2. Ensuring employees are trained in the performance management system and completion of employee's training is reported to the appropriate training coordinator designated by the Heads of EDDP.

4.8.3. Leading the employees by developing and communicating performance objectives and expectations to employees for the evaluation period within the established timelines and holding employees accountable for accomplishing them.

4.8.4. Preparing jointly with employees, to the extent practicable, development objectives for the performance year and recording them in an IDP.

4.8.5. Aligning performance objectives and employee development with organizational goals and objectives.

4.8.6. Discussing the relevance of performance elements to an employee's performance objectives and that performance elements shall be considered in the overall evaluation.

4.8.7. Providing employees meaningful, constructive, and candid feedback relative to progress against performance expectations including at least one documented midpoint review.

4.8.8. Ensuring employees are aware of their DCIPS requirements and the requirement to document their accomplishments at the end of the evaluation period.

4.8.9. Fostering and rewarding excellent performance.

4.8.10. Addressing poor performance as soon as it occurs or as soon as it becomes apparent.

4.8.11. Making meaningful distinctions among employees based on performance and contribution.

4.8.12. Completing closeout and interim performance evaluations as required within established timelines.

4.8.13. Ensuring eligible employees are assigned an evaluation of record as prescribed by this chapter.

4.8.14. Collaborating with reviewing officials to complete evaluations of record.

4.8.15. Meeting with reviewing officials to discuss consistency in the rating process.

4.8.16. Completing all USD(I) and Naval Intelligence required annual performance management system training.

4.8.17. Ensuring consistency in the rating process

4.9. Supervisors When Not the Rating Official. Supervisors normally will be the rating official for employees under their direct supervision. However, in unusual circumstances in which rating official responsibilities are assigned to an official in the chain of supervision above the immediate supervisor, the supervisor shall be responsible and accountable for collaborating with the rating official in his or her performance management responsibilities in accordance with DoD Instruction 1400.25, V2011, reference (b).

4.10. Employees are accountable for:

4.10.1. Engaging in dialog with rating officials and supervisors (when the supervisor is not the rating official) to develop performance objectives and their IDP at the beginning of

each evaluation period or when needed (e.g., new assignment, change in duties).

4.10.2. Identifying and recording their accomplishments and results throughout the evaluation period.

4.10.3. Participating in midpoint performance reviews and year-end performance evaluation discussions with their rating officials.

4.10.4. Preparing their year-end accomplishments as input to their annual performance evaluations within prescribed timeframes.

4.10.5. Understanding the link between their performance objectives and the organizational mission and goals.

4.10.6. Accepting accountability for their actions.

4.11. **EDDP DCIPS Liaisons.** The DCIPS Liaisons for each EDDP shall:

4.11.1. Manage the timeliness of the performance management process in the EDDPs and adhere to the performance management timeline provided by the Naval Intelligence CHCO.

4.11.2. Validate employee and rating data before and after the EDDPs PM PRA convenes and ensures all reporting requirements are met.

4.11.3. Perform actions in the PAA on behalf of the EDDPs PM PRA as necessary.

4.11.4. Provide administrative and logistical support to the EDDPs PM PRA.

5. THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS.

5.1. The DCIPS performance management process consists of three distinct phases: performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and evaluation of performance at the end of the performance evaluation period. The standard evaluation period for DCIPS runs from October 1 through September 30 of each year unless an exception has been granted by the USD(I). The performance evaluation period officially begins on October 1 of each year with the performance planning process.

5.2. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees shall engage in continuing dialog throughout the performance evaluation period to manage performance. Dialog shall focus on progress against performance objectives and events or obstacles which may occur during the evaluation period that could prevent successful achievement of those objectives. Any resulting modifications or formal changes in the objectives against which the employee is working should be documented at the time they are identified up to the final 90 days of the evaluation period. Additional dialog should also be ongoing throughout the evaluation period, focused on the developmental needs of the employee to increase effectiveness and on other factors within the control of the employee or supervisor that may contribute to the success of the employee and the organization. At least once during the performance evaluation period, generally at the midpoint of the period, the supervisor (in conjunction with the rating official when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall document formally the performance discussion with the employee.

5.3. At the end of the performance evaluation period, the employee shall document his or her accomplishments and submit them to the rating official (through the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) as an element of the formal evaluation of performance for the year.

5.4. The formal evaluation of the employee's performance shall include an evaluation of the extent to which the employee achieved his or her performance objectives, an evaluation of how the employee performed against the six performance elements that contribute to success, and an overall summary evaluation of record. The evaluation of the employee's performance against performance elements shall consider the extent to which the employee fulfilled his or her accountabilities as outlined in this chapter and in DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011, reference (b).

5.5. The performance management timeline will be issued by the NIA DCI&S Policy & Programs Office on an annual basis.

6. PERFORMANCE PLANNING.

6.1. Elements of Performance Planning. Performance planning shall include dialog between the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and the employee to:

6.1.1. Establish three to six performance objectives which are specific performance targets for the individual and aligned to the goals and objectives of the National Intelligence Strategy (NIS), DoD, DON, Naval Intelligence, and the employee's respective EDDP.

6.1.2. Ensure the employee receives a written performance plan and an IDP within 30 days after the beginning of an evaluation period, a newly-appointed or newly-assigned position, or when there is a change in rating official.

6.1.3. Ensure employee understanding of the relationship between the performance elements and the performance objectives as discussed in paragraph 6 of this chapter.

6.1.4. Establish specific developmental objectives in an IDP that are keyed to the attainment of competencies and skills critical to success in the job and the employee's career field, but that may not have been required qualifications for selection to the position.

6.1.5. Establish the criteria against which the employee's success shall be measured.

6.1.6. Understanding the DCIPS performance standards as outlined in Table 1 in paragraph 9.

6.2. Annual Performance Plan.

6.2.1. Purpose and Requirements. The annual performance plan shall be prepared as a record of the performance planning process in accordance with these requirements:

6.2.1.1. Every eligible employee shall be issued a written performance plan and IDP by the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) at the beginning of the annual evaluation period each year.

6.2.1.2. Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period shall have approved

performance plans and IDPs not later than 30 days after the beginning of the evaluation period.

6.2.1.3. Employees who are newly-appointed or newly-assigned to a position shall have approved performance plans and IDPs not later than 30 days from the date of appointment to the position.

6.2.1.4. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall establish performance plans in consultation with their employees.

6.2.1.5. Reviewing officials shall review and approve each performance plan to ensure its consistency with organizational goals and objectives; appropriateness to employee experience, developmental needs, and work level; and equity with other plans within the purview of the reviewing official.

6.2.2. Performance Objectives and Elements. The performance plan shall address:

6.2.2.1. Performance Objectives. Each performance plan generally should include three to six performance objectives which are specific performance targets for the individual and aligned to the goals and objectives of the National Intelligence Strategy (NIS), DoD, DON, Naval Intelligence, and the employee's respective EDDP. Each Naval Intelligence EDDP may establish a standard number of performance objectives for use by all employees within the parameters highlighted above.

a. Non-Supervisory Performance Objectives. Each non-supervisory employee shall be assigned performance objectives appropriate to the employee's grade and career or occupational category. Each objective shall be derived from organizational goals and objectives and shall be a critical element of the employee's job. Each objective shall also be structured such that it is Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bounded (SMART) in accordance with DoD 1400.25, Volume 2011, reference (b) and the guidance below.

b. Supervisory and/or Managerial Performance Objectives. Each supervisor and manager shall be assigned a supervisory/managerial objective in addition to their other objectives that correlate to their grade and career or

occupational category. Supervisors and managers under a DCIPS performance plan are accountable for achieving work results through subordinates. Therefore, performance objectives for supervisors and managers shall be prepared to reflect their progressively more demanding leadership role. Individual objectives shall be appropriate to the work level, work category, pay grade, occupational category, work assigned, and the level of supervisory or managerial responsibility. Objectives for the first-level supervisor should reflect responsibility for leading and managing the work and professional development of his or her direct report employees. Objectives for second- or higher-level managers should reflect their responsibility for setting the goals and direction of the unit, acquiring resources necessary for success, engaging in ongoing evaluation of results, and implementing necessary course corrections in pursuit of results. Rating officials shall provide subordinate supervisors and managers specific information on how achievement of objectives will be measured. Guidelines for Writing Performance Objectives, Appendix A, provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives.

c. Performance Elements for All Employees. All employees, both non-supervisory and those holding supervisory or managerial positions shall be rated against the six behaviorally-based performance elements described in paragraph 6 of this chapter and in accordance with DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011, reference (b). For supervisors and managers, the focus of each performance element shifts from the behaviors inherent in non-supervisory positions to those required of supervisors and managers responsible for leading the work of the organization. Performance expectations, even if not stated in a specific performance objective, include certain behavioral expectations that assess "how" the work performed by the employee is accomplished related to his or her conduct in the workplace and approach to accomplishing specific performance objectives, including carrying out performance management responsibilities of this chapter. These aspects of an employee's performance are captured in the performance elements against which all employees shall be rated. Employees are rated against the following six elements:

(1). Accountability for Results. DCIPS employees are expected to take responsibility for their work, setting and/or meeting priorities, and organizing and utilizing time and resources efficiently and effectively to achieve the desired results consistent with their organization's goals and objectives. In addition, supervisors and managers are expected to use these same skills to accept responsibility for and achieve results through the actions and contributions of their subordinates and their organization as a whole.

(2). Communication. DCIPS employees are expected to effectively comprehend and convey information with and from others in writing, reading, listening, and verbal and non-verbal actions. Employees are expected to use a variety of media in communicating and making presentations appropriate to the audience. In addition, DoD Intelligence Community (IC) supervisors and managers are expected to use effective communication skills to build cohesive work teams, develop individual skills, and improve performance.

(3). Critical Thinking. DCIPS employees are expected to use logic, analysis, synthesis, creativity, judgment, and systematic approaches to gather and evaluate multiple sources of information to inform decisions and outcomes. In addition, supervisors and managers are expected to establish a work environment where employees feel free to engage in open, candid exchanges of information and diverse points of view.

(4). Engagement and Collaboration. DCIPS employees have a responsibility to provide information and knowledge to achieve results. They are expected to recognize, value, build, and leverage organizationally-appropriate, diverse collaborative networks of coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, and teams within an organization and/or across the DoD, Naval Intelligence and the IC. In addition, DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to create an environment that promotes engagement, collaboration, integration, and the sharing of information and knowledge.

(5). Personal Leadership and Integrity. DCIPS employees are expected to demonstrate personal initiative and innovation as well as integrity, honesty, openness, and respect for diversity in their dealings with coworkers, peers,

customers, stakeholders, teams, and collaborative networks across the IC. DCIPS employees are also expected to demonstrate core organizational, DoD, and IC values including selfless service, a commitment to excellence, and the courage and conviction to express their professional views and to constructively address or seek assistance to properly address concerns related to the protection of classified information in accordance with Executive Order (EO)13526, reference (g) and as outlined in reference (j).

(6). Technical Expertise. DCIPS employees are expected to acquire and apply the knowledge, subject matter expertise, tradecraft, and/or technical competence necessary to achieve results. This includes the proper handling and protection of classified information in accordance with reference (g) and as outlined in reference (j).

6.2.2.2. Performance Elements for Supervisors and Managers. DCIPS supervisors and managers shall be evaluated on the managerial portion of elements 1-4 in paragraph 6. Additionally, they shall be evaluated on the following elements specific to supervisory and managerial required behaviors:

6.2.2.2.1. Leadership and Integrity. DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to exhibit the same individual personal leadership behaviors as all DCIPS employees. In their supervisory or managerial role, they are also expected to achieve organizational goals and objectives by creating a shared vision and mission within their organization; establishing a work environment that promotes diversity (of both persons and points of view), critical thinking, collaboration, and protection of classified information in accordance with reference (g) and reference (j) and information sharing; mobilizing employees, stakeholders, and networks in support of their objectives; and recognizing and rewarding individual and team excellence, enterprise focus, innovation, and collaboration.

6.2.2.2.2. Managerial Proficiency. DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to possess the technical proficiency in their mission area appropriate to their role as supervisors or managers. They are also expected to leverage that proficiency to plan for, acquire, organize, integrate, develop, and prioritize the human, financial, material, information

(including classified), and other resources to accomplish their organization's missions and objectives. In so doing, all supervisors and managers are also expected to focus on the development and productivity of their subordinates by setting clear performance expectations, providing ongoing coaching and feedback, constructively addressing or seeking assistance to properly address concerns related to the protection of classified information in accordance with reference (g) and reference (j), evaluating the contributions of individual employees to organizational results, and linking performance ratings and rewards to the accomplishment of those results.

6.2.3. Communicating the Performance Plan. Communications between rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees is critical to the success of the performance management process; therefore, communication between the employee and the supervisor regarding the content and expectations contained in the performance plan is critical to setting the tone for the annual performance management process. The initial dialog between the employee and the supervisor sets the stage for follow-up midpoint and evaluation reviews throughout the evaluation period.

6.2.3.1. Performance objectives shall be communicated to the employee in writing within 30 days after the beginning of the evaluation period and whenever there is a need to modify an existing objective or add new objectives as a result of changes in mission priorities.

6.2.3.2. Dialog on the performance plan shall include but not be limited to:

a. The relationship between the employee's performance objectives, the goals and objectives of the local work unit, and the broader strategic objectives for the current and future years contained in the NIS, Defense Intelligence guidance, and the goals and objectives of the employee's EDDP.

b. Examples of how the supervisor shall assess employee accomplishments against performance objectives (quantitative and qualitative).

c. The relationship between the performance elements and standards against which the employee shall be assessed and the accomplishment of performance objectives..

6.2.4. Annual IDP. An IDP is prepared jointly by the rating official and employee as part of the annual performance planning process and outlines development objectives for the upcoming performance year. The IDP should serve as a living document to assist the rating official and employee manage career development objectives. Employee IDPs shall be consistent with the guidance set forth in this chapter and in DoD Instruction 1400.25, reference (e).

6.2.4.1. Every eligible employee shall be issued a written IDP by the rating official (developed in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) at the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

6.2.4.2. Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period shall have approved IDPs not later than 30 days after the beginning of the period.

6.2.4.3. Employees who are newly-appointed or newly-assigned to a position shall have approved IDPs not later than 30 days from the date of appointment to the position.

6.2.4.4. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall establish IDPs considering input from their employees.

6.2.4.5. Reviewing officials shall review and approve each IDP to ensure its consistency with organizational goals and objectives; appropriateness to employee experience, developmental needs, and pay level; and equity with other IDPs within the purview of the reviewing official.

6.2.4.6. Each EDDP may create its own standardized forms.

6.2.5. Approval of Performance Plans. The reviewing official must approve an employee's performance plan in the Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) before the rating official can communicate the plan to the employee. The performance plan and IDP are considered approved when the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) has communicated the plan to the employee in writing following approval by the reviewing

official. The rating official shall record in the PAA the employee's receipt of the performance plan, including the IDP and the manner in which it was communicated (face-to-face, e-mail, fax, etc.) to the employee.

7. MANAGING PERFORMANCE.

7.1. Monitoring. Rating officials are responsible for managing the performance of subordinates to achieve the goals and objectives of the organization. To be effective in their role, rating officials shall (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official):

7.1.2. Engage in dialog throughout the evaluation period with their employees concerning their progress toward achieving performance objectives, behaviors related to successful performance, and their individual development.

7.1.3. Hold one or more formal performance reviews with each employee during the evaluation cycle and document at least one review conducted at the midpoint of the evaluation period.

7.1.4. Maintain performance and development information on their employees to be used to provide feedback and conduct the year-end performance evaluation.

7.1.5. Update performance objectives in consultation with the employee when changing priorities or conditions beyond the control of the employee and/or supervisor indicate a need for change.

7.1.6. Anticipate and address performance deficiencies as they appear.

7.1.7. Acknowledge and reinforce effective behaviors demonstrated by the employee in the accomplishment of his or her job objectives.

7.2. Active Engagement. Actively managing employee performance during the evaluation period serves to increase the productivity and morale of the work unit by reinforcing the effective behaviors of the most productive employees and ensuring early intervention to address performance deficiencies when they may occur.

7.3. Dialog and Feedback.

7.3.1. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall provide regular and timely feedback to all employees throughout the evaluation period regarding their performance. Regular dialog regarding performance is the primary means by which rating officials and employees ensure optimal accomplishment of organizational objectives. Feedback should be provided in the form of a two-way dialog during which the employee and rating official identify what is going well, how performance may be improved, and whether performance objectives require adjustment. Face-to-face is the preferred method of rating official and employee dialog. However, where geographic or other forms of separation make routine face-to-face meetings difficult or impossible, other means such as telephone or e-mail exchanges should be used to ensure that ongoing dialog takes place.

7.3.2. Although rating officials are primarily accountable for ensuring that dialog regarding employee performance takes place, employees also have a responsibility to ensure that they receive continuing feedback on their performance. Employees may and should request periodic feedback from their rating officials to ensure there is a common understanding of expectations and progress being made toward meeting the performance objectives and performance elements within the evaluation period.

7.4. Minimum Period of Performance. Unless otherwise excluded, this chapter applies to employees who at a minimum have been or are expected to be appointed or assigned to a Naval Intelligence DCIPS position and performing under an approved DCIPS performance plan for at least 90 days during the current evaluation period, but not to extend beyond the September 30 end-of-rating-period date. Periods of less than 90 days not included in the current evaluation period will be covered in the subsequent evaluation period.

7.4.1. Only continuous performance in a DCIPS position or in an approved detail or assignment to a non-DCIPS position may be used to satisfy the 90-day minimum period described in paragraph 7.4 of this chapter.

7.4.2. Employees who have performed the minimum period shall be issued an evaluation of record in accordance with the procedures prescribed by this chapter.

7.4.3. Employees who have not completed the minimum period of performance during the applicable evaluation period shall not be rated, and therefore generally will not be eligible for a performance payout except as specifically authorized by the policies and procedures in DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011, reference (b). Employees who are not ratable because they have not or will not have performed the minimum required period of service shall be advised by the rating official during the initial performance planning session.

7.5. Adjustment of Performance Objectives During the Evaluation Period. Performance objectives should be reviewed regularly by the employee and the rating official and adjusted when necessary to reflect changing priorities of the organization or when unanticipated events beyond the control of the employee and rating official make the performance objective unachievable. When adjusting performance expectations, supervisors and employees must follow the requirements for planning, communicating, monitoring, and assessing expectations established in this chapter. Adjustments to or changes in performance objectives shall be approved by the reviewing official prior to effecting any change. An employee must be assigned a modified or new objective for at least 90 days to be rated on that objective. Any changes to objectives must be made prior to the last 90 days of the evaluation period.

7.6. Adding Performance Objectives. When new performance objectives are assigned to an employee during the evaluation period (e.g., due to a job change, additional duties, promotion, change in organizational objectives), the new objectives must be structured such that they can be accomplished during the remaining portion of the evaluation period. New objectives must be added to the performance plan at least 90 days prior to the end of the evaluation period to be included in the annual evaluation of performance.

7.7. Mandatory Midpoint Performance Review. Feedback between the rating official and employee should be continuous throughout the evaluation period. However, in addition to ongoing feedback, rating officials shall conduct and document at least one formal performance review for each of his or her employees at or near the midpoint of the evaluation period. During this review, the rating official and employee shall discuss achievements to date against performance objectives and any areas for improvement. Both the supervisor and employee shall examine current performance objectives to determine whether adjustments are necessary, and shall formally document any required changes to the objectives for the remainder of the year in accordance with the instructions in subparagraph 5.2 of this chapter.

7.7.1. For employees who are on track to meet or exceed expectations for their performance objectives, the rating official shall document and retain for the record the outcome of the midpoint review including the date on which the session took place and any changes in objectives or other summary information regarding the conversation. Any documentation will be maintained as a part of that employee's official performance record.

7.7.2. For employees who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or are otherwise at risk of receiving a rating lower than "Successful," the rating official shall document and retain for the record all performance deficiencies and all actions the rating official and employee will take during the period leading to the evaluation of record to improve performance to the "Successful" level. Documentation for the record shall be maintained as part of the official performance record.

7.7.3. The employee shall be given a copy of the midpoint review document which shall not include individual or overall ratings. The rating official shall record in the performance evaluation system the employee's receipt of the midpoint review and the manner in which the review was communicated.

7.7.4. If the rating official is not available to conduct the mandatory midpoint review, the reviewing official or other more senior management official in the employee's direct chain of supervision with knowledge of the employee's performance shall conduct the review.

8. DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE.

8.1. Employee Development. Developing employee skills and abilities to contribute to the intelligence mission is an integral part of the performance management process. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) are responsible for discussing the individual developmental needs of each of their employees during the performance management dialogue.

8.2. Monitoring Progress Against the IDP.

8.2.1. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees shall jointly review progress against the objectives of the IDP as part of the ongoing dialog process during the evaluation period. Reference (e) of this chapter provides specific guidance on the IDP process.

8.2.2. During the formal midpoint performance review, rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall address progress against the IDP and its relationship to the accomplishment of employee performance objectives. Rating officials should make specific reference to the relationship between IDP objectives and improving competence in areas addressed by the performance elements, and other career-group-specific and occupational-category-specific competencies from which the performance elements were derived. The performance elements and related competencies form the basis for supervisors to assist their employees with the individual development required for continued improvements in their ability to contribute to the intelligence mission.

8.2.3. Rating officials are responsible for ensuring that employees have access to resources including internal and external training, mentoring, and assignments throughout the IC; individual coaching by the rating official (and the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official); and other resources that contribute to the success of employees when measured against their performance plans and IDPs and to improved productivity of the organization. DoD Instruction 1400.25, reference (e) will provide additional guidance on development and the IDP process.

8.3. Addressing Requirements for Performance Improvement.

Rating officials are accountable for early identification of employee performance issues that may lead to a performance evaluation of record of less than "Successful." They are also accountable for early identification of employees who are not on track to meet their performance expectations. For employees experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or are otherwise at risk of receiving a rating of less than a "Successful," level, the rating official shall contact their servicing HRO Employee Management Relations (EMR) for guidance as early as possible in the performance year. The rating official should be prepared to present documentation of all performance deficiencies to the EMR Office and be able to discuss a course of action that is intended to help improve the employee's performance to the "Successful" level. Documentation for the record such as a Performance Advisory Notification (PAN) or a formal plan for performance improvement shall be maintained by the EDDPs and EMR Office. Early action is essential to improving performance or setting the stage for further action when performance does not improve to the "Successful" level or higher, including adverse personnel action in accordance with procedures to be prescribed in Volume 2009 of reference (e) and as supplemented by Naval Intelligence guidance.

8.3.1. Early and Frequent Dialog. At the first indication that an employee is not on track to meet his or her performance expectations for the year, the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall schedule a feedback session with the employee to explore the performance issues and set a documented course of action for improving performance during the remainder of the evaluation period. Feedback shall include:

8.3.1.1. Discussion of the specific areas in which performance improvement is required such as restatement of the expectations for specific results and behaviors, exploration of barriers to success, and specific actions that the employee and supervisor shall take to improve performance.

8.3.1.2. Identification of resources available to improve performance such as offering the employee the support that is most likely to contribute to performance improvement, (e.g. additional job-specific training, performance coaching, frequent

follow-up performance review sessions, or such other support as may be indicated.)

8.3.2. Documentation. If, in the rating official's judgment, an employee's performance is such that failure to improve could result in a summary evaluation of "Unacceptable" or "Minimally Successful" at the end of the evaluation period, the rating official shall document feedback sessions with the employee throughout the remainder of the evaluation period. Documentation shall be provided to the employee and shall include, at a minimum, a statement of the performance requiring improvement, the performance improvement actions that the supervisor and employee have agreed to implement, and the consequences of failure to demonstrate acceptable performance improvement.

8.3.2.1. Prior to issuing a "Minimally Successful" rating, the rating official must have consulted with the reviewing official and EMR Office and issued a PAN to the employee in accordance with EMR's guidance. The PAN shall:

a. Advise the employee that he or she is currently performing at the "Minimally Successful" level.

b. Communicate to the employee the performance improvement actions which must be taken to correct the deficiency.

c. Notify the employee if corrections are not made, and the performance does not improve to the "Successful" level, the employee will receive an annual rating of "Minimally Successful".

8.3.2.2. Prior to issuing an "Unacceptable" rating, the rating official must have consulted with the reviewing official and EMR Office and issued a formal plan for performance improvement to the employee in accordance with Naval Intelligence EMR guidance. There is no requirement to issue a PAN before issuing a plan for performance improvement. The performance improvement period must end by Sept 1; therefore an employee may not be placed on a plan for performance improvement later than July 1 for the plan for performance improvement to count towards the current Performance Cycle. The plan for performance improvement must do the following:

a. Advise the employee that he or she is performing at an "Unacceptable" level.

b. Identify each objective or element which is not being met, and specifically describe how the employee's performance is failing to meet the objective or element.

c. Explain specifically what must be done to meet the objective and element.

d. Identify resources which are available to the employee to assist them in bringing their performance to the "Successful" level.

e. Advise the employee that he or she has 90 calendar days to bring his or her performance to the "Successful" level, and a performance rating will be issued at the end of the 90 day period.

f. Advise the employee that if his or her performance reaches the "Successful" level, he or she must maintain that level of performance for a period of one year after the end of the plan for performance improvement. If the "Successful" level is not maintained, reassignment, demotion, or removal can be taken without further opportunity to improve.

8.3.2.3. At the end of the plan for performance improvement period, the rating official shall complete a performance evaluation on the employee. If the employee's performance improves sufficiently to warrant a "Successful" level or higher summary evaluation of record, no further action or documentation is required beyond continued performance monitoring. The employee shall be under close supervision for a period of one year. If the employee's performance declines to an "Unacceptable" level during the one year period after successful completion of the Plan for Performance Improvement (PPI), the employee may be reassigned, demoted, or removed from Federal service without another performance improvement period. However, should the employee fail to improve sufficiently to warrant a "Successful" or higher rating, the rating official shall consult with the reviewing official and coordinate with the EMR Office to identify and take the appropriate action, which may include reassignment, demotion, or removal from Federal service.

8.3.3. Disciplinary and Adverse Action. If the rating official believes an employee's performance may warrant adverse action at or before the end of the evaluation period, he or she shall follow the procedures in Volume 2009 of reference (e) and in Naval Intelligence policies. Rating officials should seek advice from their servicing human resources professional on the appropriate actions to be followed in accordance with Reference (1).

9. **YEAR-END PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**. The year-end performance evaluation prepared by the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) provides the official documentation of the performance evaluation period. If done in the manner prescribed in this chapter, the evaluation of record provides an official record of the ongoing performance dialog between the rating official and employee that has taken place over the course of the evaluation period. The written evaluation captures the employee's accomplishments against agreed-upon performance objectives and his or her performance against the standards for the six performance elements, and provides an official evaluation of record that will inform the annual performance-based pay-decision process.

9.1. **Rating Performance Objectives**.

9.1.1. Employee Self-Report of Accomplishments.

9.1.1.1. Employees are the most knowledgeable source of their individual accomplishments against their objectives. To continue the performance dialog between supervisors and employees into the performance evaluation process, employees are expected to submit a personal report of their accomplishments for the evaluation period. The report shall address accomplishments against each performance objective. The employee self-report of his or her accomplishments should also address performance elements. It will become a part of the performance record and shall be used by the rating official as input to his or her evaluation of the employee's accomplishment in the year-end performance evaluation. When employees and rating officials differ in their perceptions of accomplishments, the rating official shall address the differences in the year-end performance dialog.

9.1.1.2. To facilitate completion of the self-report of accomplishments, employees are encouraged to maintain a record of their accomplishments throughout the evaluation period.

9.1.1.3. Employees will complete their self-report of accomplishments and forward it to the rating official according to a schedule determined by the Component, but not later than the established Naval Intelligence timeframes published each year. Component guidance may require that self-reports be completed prior to the end of the evaluation period, but shall ensure that all performance during the period is documented and considered in the evaluation process.

9.1.2. Rating Official Evaluation of Performance. The rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall prepare a narrative and numerical evaluation for each eligible employee in accordance with guidelines prescribed in this chapter.

9.1.2.1. The rating official shall prepare a brief narrative evaluation of the employee's accomplishments for each performance objective and outcomes of the work performed with appropriate consideration of the employee's self-report. The effects of the employee's accomplishments on the organizational goals and objectives should also be addressed.

9.1.2.2. Rating officials shall complete their evaluation of employee performance within the established Naval Intelligence timeframes published each year.

9.1.2.3. Accomplishment of performance objectives shall be rated using a 5-point rating scale as described in Table 1 of this chapter.

9.1.2.4. Separate whole number ratings shall be assigned to each performance objective. Each numerical rating shall take into account the degree to which the objective was achieved in accordance with the guidance in Table 1. A rating of "1," "Unacceptable," on any performance objective shall result in a summary objective rating of "Unacceptable" and an overall summary rating of "Unacceptable."

9.1.2.5. An overall rating for accomplishment of performance objectives shall be assigned by computing the arithmetic average of all assigned performance objective

ratings. The overall rating for performance objectives shall be rounded up to the nearest tenth of a point using standard rounding procedures as described in reference (b).

9.1.2.6. Objective ratings of "Not Rated (NR)" shall not be included in the computation of overall summary average ratings.

Table 1. General Standards Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors

PERFORMANCE RATING	OBJECTIVES DESCRIPTORS	ELEMENT DESCRIPTORS
OUTSTANDING (5)	<p>The employee far exceeded expected results on the objective such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee far exceeded expected results on all performance objectives such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.</p> <p>Such exemplary achievements serve as a role model for others.</p>	<p>The employee consistently performed all key behaviors at an exemplary level on the element.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee consistently performed at an exemplary level on all performance elements.</p> <p>The employee served as a role model for others.</p>
EXCELLENT (4)	<p>The employee surpassed expected results in a substantial manner on the objective.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee surpassed expected results overall and in a substantial manner on most of the objectives with an average rating within the "Exceptional" range in Table 2.</p>	<p>The employee demonstrated mastery-level performance of the key behaviors on the element.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee demonstrated mastery-level performance on most key elements with an average rating within the "Exceptional" range in Table 2.</p>
SUCCESSFUL (3)	<p>The employee achieved expected results on the assigned objective.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee achieved expected or higher results overall and on most assigned objectives with an average rating within the "Successful" range in Table 2.</p>	<p>The employee fully demonstrated effective, capable performance of key behaviors for the performance element.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee demonstrated effective, capable performance or higher on key behaviors on most performance elements with an average rating within the "Successful" range in Table 2.</p>
MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL (2)	<p>The employee only partially achieved expected results on the performance objective.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee only partially achieved expected results for assigned objectives with an average rating within the "Minimally Successful" range in Table 2.</p>	<p>The employee's performance requires improvement on one or more of the key behaviors for the objective.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee's behavior requires improvement with an average rating that falls within the "Minimally Successful" range in Table 2.</p>
UNACCEPTABLE (1)	<p>The employee failed to achieve expected results in one or more assigned performance objectives.</p>	<p>The employee failed to adequately demonstrate key behaviors for the performance element.</p> <p>At the summary level, the employee received a rating of "Unacceptable" on average for the performance elements.</p>
NR	<p>The employee did not have the opportunity to complete the objective because it became obsolete due to changing mission requirements or because of extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the employee and supervisor (e.g., resources diverted to higher-priority programs, employee in long-term training, deployed, on leave without pay).</p>	<p>Not used for performance elements.</p>

9.2. Rating Performance Elements.

9.2.1 Each performance element for an employee shall be rated using the 5-point rating scale in Table 1 above. Performance against each element shall be rated by comparing employee performance against the narrative behavioral descriptors for each element contained in the DCIPS general performance standards. The rating for an element shall be the highest level within the standard descriptors for which the employee fully meets the letter and intent of the element rating. If the employee does not fully meet the behavioral descriptor, the rating shall be assigned to the next lower level. The "NR" rating may not be used for performance elements. Any employee who has met the minimum requirements for receiving a performance rating shall be rated on all performance elements.

9.2.2. The rating official shall prepare a brief narrative summary of the employee's performance against each of the six DCIPS performance elements. The narrative shall highlight brief examples of employee actions that support the numerical rating assigned in accordance with Table 1.

9.2.3. An employee's overall rating against the six performance elements shall be computed in accordance with guidance set forth by USD(I) as outlined in reference (b). The overall rating for performance elements shall be rounded to the nearest 10th of a point using standard rounding procedures.

9.3. Performance Evaluation of Record

9.3.1. All employees shall receive an overall performance evaluation of record that reflects the combined accomplishments against objectives and performance against the six performance elements. The evaluation of record shall be computed by calculating the arithmetic average of the overall performance objectives rating and the overall performance elements rating, except when the employee has received an overall rating of "1" for accomplishment of performance objectives. Finally, the evaluation of record is calculated by averaging the overall performance objective rating and the overall performance element rating. The weighting of the performance objectives and elements shall be set in accordance with guidance issued by USD(I) as outlined in reference (b). In situations where an evaluation of "Unacceptable" is assigned to any performance

objective, an overall summary evaluation of record of "1" shall be assigned. The average rating shall be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point and converted to an evaluation of record rating and descriptor using the standards in Table 2 as a guide. Ratings of record will be converted to and recorded as a whole number using Table 2.

Table 2. Converting Average Rating to Evaluation of Record

AVERAGE RATING RANGE	EVALUATION OF RECORD RATING/DESCRIPTOR	GENERAL STANDARD
4.6-5.0	OUTSTANDING (5)	The employee's overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has had extraordinary effects or impacts on mission objectives that would not otherwise have been achieved.
3.6-4.5	EXCELLENT (4)	The employee's overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has had a significant impact on mission objectives.
2.6-3.5	SUCCESSFUL (3)	The employee's overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has made a positive impact on mission objectives.
2.0-2.5	MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL (2)	The employee's overall contribution to mission, although positive, has been less than that expected.
<2 on any objective	UNACCEPTABLE (1)	The employee received an "Unacceptable" rating on one or more performance objectives and/or the employee has an average rating of less than 2.0 based on performance elements summary ratings.

9.3.2. Any employee who receives a summary rating of "1" on the performance objectives shall receive an evaluation of record of "1" or "Unacceptable."

9.3.3. Rating officials shall complete their evaluation of employee performance within 30 days following the end of the evaluation period.

9.3.4. Reviewing officials and rating officials may not communicate the ratings to employees until after the Naval Intelligence PM PRA certifies the ratings of record

9.3.5. An employee's current DCIPS performance evaluation of record (closeout, interim, or temporary assignment report of

performance) moves with them to a new position in the same EDDP or other DCIPS organization.

9.4. Reviewing Official's Review and Approval of the Evaluation of Performance.

9.4.1. The proposed performance evaluation of record must be approved by the reviewing official and the EDDP PM PRA and certified by the Naval Intelligence PM PRA prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee. The inclusion of the reviewing official in the performance evaluation process prior to providing feedback to the employee is not intended to limit ongoing dialog between the rating official and the employee regarding ongoing performance. Rather, it is to ensure that the rating official has considered the perspective of the reviewing official from his or her vantage point over several organizational units and any changes directed by the reviewing official or PM PRA are adopted before sharing with the employee.

9.4.2. The reviewing official normally shall be the rating official's rater; however, it may also be another official in the management chain above the rating official, and in some unusual circumstances the reviewing and rating official may be the same official. An example of such circumstances include a situation in which the rater is a senior executive or other senior official who reports to a more senior executive who has no direct knowledge of the employee's performance. See reference (b) for additional information and clarification of the roles and responsibilities.

9.4.3. Reviewing officials are normally Naval Intelligence employees, but non-Naval Intelligence employees may be used where the structure prevents this from being possible.

9.4.4. Reviewing officials shall review numerical and narrative ratings provided by the rating official for consistency with guidance provided by the reviewing official at the beginning of the evaluation period, congruence between numerical ratings assigned and supporting narrative, consistency across rating officials within the reviewing official's organizational elements, compliance with merit system principles, and adherence to DCIPS and other relevant policy.

9.4.5. On completion of his or her review, if the reviewing official agrees with the evaluation provided by the rating

official, he or she shall provide concurrence and additional narrative based on first-hand knowledge of the employee's work and impact that would further clarify the employee's contributions for consideration during the pay pool decision process.

9.4.6. If the reviewing official does not agree with the narrative or numerical ratings provided by the rating official, the reviewing official shall return the evaluation to the rating official and direct changes to be made. The rating official and reviewing official will discuss the areas of disagreement, preferably in a face-to-face conversation however, if that is not possible, the reviewing official should provide written feedback to the rating official on the areas of disagreement and the recommended remediation. If the rating official does not accept the reviewing official's suggested changes, the reviewing official may direct a change in the rating, or if necessary, make changes to ensure consistency in the application of standards and guidance within the reviewing official's purview. The basis for the directed changes shall be documented and maintained by the reviewing official until all actions relative to the annual performance evaluation and pay-decision processes are completed and closed.

9.4.7. In situations where the reviewing official must direct a change in performance rating for a subordinate, the reviewing official should consider the effectiveness of the rating official in evaluating the rating official's performance.

9.4.8. The reviewing official shall complete his or her review of all performance evaluations within his or her purview within 45 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period but must not submit their final approval until after the PM PRA review and approval process is completed and they are advised to proceed.

9.4.9. Reviewing officials are encouraged to consider support of and actions throughout the performance management process when evaluating the work performance of rating officials under their purview.

9.5. **PM PRA Structure.** The Naval Intelligence PRA structure will consist of two levels of PRA review, the Naval Intelligence level and the EDDP PRA level.

9.5.1. The Naval Intelligence PM PRA. The NIAH or delegate is responsible for ensuring consistency across all the Activities and Commands.

9.5.2. The EDDPs PM PRA consists of a senior leader or group of leaders who provide oversight of employee evaluations and ratings across the EDDPs to ensure consistency. EDDP PM PRAs may use a performance review board, which generally consists of senior leaders within the chain of supervision, to assist in reviewing evaluations and ratings across their organization.

9.6. EDDP PM PRA Review and Approval of Performance Evaluations of Record. Concurrent with the reviewing official's action, all evaluations of record and a summary of the distribution of the ratings are forwarded to the PM PRA for final review and approval to ensure consistency across rating officials, supervisors, and reviewing officials and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

9.6.1. When the EDDP PM PRA determines that there are inconsistencies requiring action, the EDDP PM PRA shall seek to resolve the apparent discrepancies with the accountable reviewing officials.

9.6.2. Where appropriate, the EDDP PM PRA may suggest corrective action prior to approval of ratings by the reviewing officials to ensure the integrity of the performance evaluation process.

9.6.3. The EDDPs PM PRA shall complete the performance evaluation review process in accordance with Naval Intelligence prescribed timelines, not later than 45 days following the end of the evaluation period, and may not communicate final ratings to employees until certified by the Naval Intelligence PM PRA.

9.7. Naval Intelligence PM PRA Review of Performance Ratings. Upon the EDDPs PM PRA's approval of the ratings, the Naval Intelligence PM PRA will review a summary of performance ratings to ensure consistency across all Naval Intelligence EDDPs and compliance with applicable policies, instructions, and procedures.

9.7.1. Where appropriate, the Naval Intelligence PM PRA may suggest corrective action prior to approval of ratings by the

reviewing officials to ensure the integrity of the performance evaluation process and adherence to policy. The Naval Intelligence PM PRA must consult with legal counsel to ensure his or her actions conform to law.

9.7.2. Upon certification of all ratings by the Naval Intelligence PM PRA, the pay pool process may begin.

9.8. Communicating the Evaluation of Record to the Employee.

9.8.1. Rating officials are responsible for providing feedback to employees on their evaluation of record on receipt of approval of evaluations from the reviewing official after the Naval Intelligence PM PRA has certified all ratings. The dialog on the formal performance evaluation document should represent the culmination of year-long ongoing feedback between the supervisor and employee regarding performance. An employee should not be surprised by the feedback that they receive at the end of the evaluation period.

9.8.2. Feedback provided to the employee should include a discussion of the accomplishments during the year and how work-related behaviors captured in the performance elements may have contributed to or inhibited overall success. The overall numerical rating of record, as well as the performance objective ratings and the performance elements ratings shall be communicated to the employee. The discussion should also focus on achievements against developmental goals for the year and what additional developmental objectives may contribute to continued improvements in employee performance.

9.8.3. When employees and rating officials differ in their perceptions of accomplishments, the rating official shall address the differences in the year-end performance dialogue. Differences should be resolved at the lowest level possible and, if necessary, brought to the attention of the EDDPs PM PRA and respective EMR Office. If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the performance evaluation, the employee should first contact the rating and reviewing officials within 5 calendar days of the employee's receipt of the rating to resolve the disagreement informally. The rater and/or reviewing official are expected to respond to the employee within 5 calendar days from the day the employee raises the disagreement. If the employee, rater, and reviewer are unable to resolve the employee's issue

within this 10-day period, the employee may pursue the formal administrative reconsideration process delineated in paragraph 12 of this chapter.

9.9. Performance Management and Within-Grade Increases (WGIs).

WGIs are awarded to employees in the GG pay series and serve to reward employees with a step increase for sustained performance at the "Successful" level or above, as well as experience and expertise. DCIPS awards WGIs to employees based on the performance evaluations of record provided the employee has met the "Successful" level and above performance evaluations of record equating to the required acceptable level of competence determination. WGIs are awarded up to and including the Step 10 at each grade level, following waiting periods provided in part 531.405 of Title 5 Code of Federal Regulations, reference (m). WGIs are not awarded to permit employee salaries to be set in the DCIPS extended pay range provided for in DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volumes 2006 and 2008 of reference (e). It is the supervisor's responsibility to track employee WGI due dates and performance progress throughout the performance cycle. Rating officials should seek advice from their serving HRO professionals on the appropriate actions to be followed in accordance with Volume 2009 of reference (e).

9.9.1. To earn a WGI, the employee's performance must be at an acceptable level of competence. To meet this requirement, an employee's most recent performance evaluation of record must be at least a "Successful." Employees who have not had sufficient time to earn a performance evaluation of record will be presumed to have performed at least at the "Successful" level, unless the rating official has documented that performance appears to be at the level below "Successful."

9.9.2. EDDPs will follow the established process for identifying and withholding the next scheduled WGI based on performance being observed or documented as being at a level below "Successful." In all cases where there is a risk of an employee receiving an overall performance evaluation of record of less than "Successful", rating officials should consult their employee relations staff or other appropriate advisors for guidance.

9.9.3. Employees will be informed when a negative determination regarding acceptable level of competence has been

made and his or her WGI has been or will be delayed in accordance with Naval Intelligence timelines. This notification to the employee will include necessary actions for the employee to take to improve performance to an acceptable level of competence and the timeline for the review to determine if the employee has raised the level of competence, as measured against the performance standards, for a sustained period of time to justify granting the WGI.

9.9.4. EDDPs will establish a process for reviewing employee performance and determining if the performance has reached the "Successful" level and is being sustained at that level. Component processes will include the requirement that an evaluation should occur within 90 calendar days of the date the WGI was withheld and subsequent evaluations at 90 calendar day intervals, if needed. If an employee's performance remains below "Successful" for 52 weeks from the original eligibility date for the WGI, a new withholding determination will be made, including new notification to the employee.

9.9.5. When it is determined that the employee's performance has improved and is sustained at the "Successful" level, EDDPs must grant the WGI for the employee. Sustained performance in this context is performance documented in accordance with Naval Intelligence guidance as the norm, vice a single episode of improvement. The effective date of the WGI is the first day of the first pay period after the acceptable determination is made.

10. INTERIM PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PERIOD. During the performance evaluation period, events may occur that result either in a change of the rating official or a reassignment of the employee. Similarly, an employee may be temporarily removed from direct supervision of the rating official as a result of temporary assignments or deployments that do not result in a permanent change in the rating official. The special procedures intended to address these special situations are:

10.1. Closeout Performance Evaluation. When the rating official has been the employee's rater for at least 90 calendar days and there are at least 90 calendar days remaining in the performance period but the rating official will no longer be the

employee's rater, the rating official shall complete a brief narrative description of the employee's performance, accomplishments, and contributions within the PAA during the current evaluation period and assign numerical evaluations to the performance elements, objectives, and overall evaluation in accordance with the year-end performance evaluation process. Closeout performance evaluations shall be approved by the reviewing official and the PM PRA as with the performance evaluation of record. Generally, this situation exists on reassignment or separation of either the employee or rating official.

10.1.1. A closeout performance evaluation is required only when the rating official and employee relationship has existed with an approved performance plan for a period of at least 90 calendar days.

10.1.2. Closeout performance evaluations shall be completed on all employees detailed to another organization for periods of 90 calendar days or more whose assignments or deployments ends with at least 90 calendar days remaining in the evaluation period. Such evaluations shall be completed by a supervisor or manager responsible for the employee's work while on detail or deployment. The completed closeout evaluation shall be forwarded to the employee's rating official for consideration in the preparation of the evaluation of record. EDDPs are responsible for developing and sharing guidance with gaining supervisors for providing closeouts, including for those employees on deployments.

10.1.3. Rating officials shall consider information contained in all closeout performance evaluations when determining the performance evaluation of record.

10.1.4. A closeout performance evaluation will become the final performance evaluation of record, rather than input in developing the final evaluation of record, in circumstances where the final performance evaluation of record cannot be completed. When such occurs, employees must be informed and must be advised of the process to resolve disputed ratings as outlined in paragraph 12 of this of this chapter that apply. Timelines begin the date the employee has been informed that the closeout performance evaluation has become the performance evaluation of record.

10.2. Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance.

Many employees within Naval Intelligence are called upon to accept temporary or interim assignments and deployments in support of the national and Defense Intelligence missions. Often these assignments may be for periods of less than 90 calendar days, but during which time the employee is making significant contributions to the mission of the DoD or the IC. For such assignments, and for reassignments, realignments, and supervisor changes for periods of less than 90 calendar days, it is important that the contributions of the employee be officially documented for consideration during the year-end performance evaluation process.

10.2.1. For periods of deployment or temporary assignment for 90 calendar days or less or that otherwise do not require a closeout performance evaluation, the supervisor at the location of deployment or temporary assignment who is knowledgeable of the employee's contributions to that organization shall complete a brief narrative of the employee's contributions during the deployment for submission to the employee's rating official at the parent EDDP.

10.2.2. In their submission of accomplishments for either the full annual or closeout evaluation period, employees should include a brief summary of their accomplishments during any deployments or temporary assignments completed during the current performance evaluation period.

10.2.3. Rating officials are responsible for ensuring that all periods of deployment or temporary assignment in support of the DoD and IC mission are considered and documented during the year-end performance evaluation.

11. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. A quick reference to the special circumstances below and how they should be handled during the performance management process can be found in the Quick Reference Performance Management Special Situations, Appendix B, of this chapter.

11.1. Intelligence Community Joint Duty Rotational Assignment Report of Performance. Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Statement of Strategic Intent, "Strategic Intent for the Defense Intelligence Enterprise," August 2007, reference

(h), provides more detailed policy on Joint Duty Assignments (JDA). Performance expectations for individuals on a JDA shall be established by a management official in the gaining element who has been designated as the individual's immediate supervisor/performance rating official.

11.1.1. Annual performance evaluations for employees on a JDA shall be completed by a management official in the gaining element who has been designated as the individual's immediate supervisor/performance rating official. Such evaluations shall be reviewed and approved by the second level supervisor/performance reviewing official in the gaining element. The reviewing official shall consult with a designated point of contact from the individual's employing element and provide that official with an opportunity to review and provide additional written comments on the employee's performance, which shall be included in the evaluation form before a final performance evaluation is provided to the employee.

11.1.2. The gaining element shall determine whether an employee on JDA shall receive a performance bonus. Funding for performance bonuses awarded to an employee on a JDA shall be the responsibility of the gaining element.

11.1.3. After the conclusion of its annual performance evaluation process, the gaining element is responsible for providing information to the employing element on the final performance ratings and bonuses accorded to the employee.

11.1.4. IC agencies and elements shall automatically provide an employee joint duty credit for a permanent or temporary rotational assignment that meets the criteria, so long as that employee received performance ratings of "Successful" or equivalent or higher during the period of that assignment.

11.2. **Employees detailed to another organization (Not on a JDA MOU).** Closeout performance evaluations shall be completed for all employees detailed to another organization and on deployments for periods of 90 days or more. Such evaluations shall be completed by a supervisor or manager responsible for the employee's work while on detail or deployment. The completed closeout evaluation shall be forwarded to the employee's rating official for consideration in the preparation of the annual performance evaluation.

11.3. Employees Absent to Perform Military Service. Employees who are absent from their positions to perform military service shall be entitled to all protections of title 38, U.S. Code reference (n), commonly referred to as the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act.

11.3.1. Employees who leave their positions during an evaluation period to serve a period of active military service, and who have completed at least 90 calendar days under their performance plan, shall be entitled to a closeout performance evaluation in accordance with subparagraph 10.1 of this chapter.

11.3.2. Employees who return to their positions following a period of military service who do not have the required 90 days of civilian service under a performance plan during the current evaluation period at the close of the evaluation period, shall be awarded a presumptive evaluation of record. The presumptive evaluation will be their last summary evaluation of record prior to departure for military service, but not less than a summary rating of "Successful" for the evaluation period that has closed.

11.4. Employees Absent on Workers' Compensation. Employees absent from their positions on workers' compensation shall be handled in accordance with the procedures in paragraph 11.3. of this chapter.

11.5. Employees Absent Due to Other Special Circumstances. Employees absent from their positions on long-term training or other special circumstances shall be handled in accordance with the policies established below.

11.5.1. Employees who are absent from their permanent position for long-term training, paid leave, or other special circumstances, who have completed the minimum period of performance for a rating in their permanent position will participate in the performance evaluation and pay pool process at the end of the performance evaluation cycle. The evaluation of record will be based on the performance and contributions made by the employee while in his or her permanent position performing under an approved DCIPS performance plan. DCIPS performance management procedures will be observed to the extent practicable.

11.5.2. Employees who are absent from their permanent position for long-term training who have NOT completed the minimum period of performance for an evaluation of record in their permanent position will receive a presumptive rating of record. The presumptive rating shall be their last summary rating of record prior to departure for training, but not less than a summary rating of "Successful." If a rating of record from a prior period is not available, the employee shall receive a summary rating of "Successful." If the employee's last evaluation of record was less than "Successful," the EDDP should consult with their servicing HRO EMR office.

11.5.3. All other employees absent from their permanent position who have NOT completed the minimum period of performance, not addressed in the above paragraphs, are not eligible for a presumptive rating. New employees who do not have 90 days in the rating period are not rated on objectives or elements.

11.6. **Administrative Error.** Employees who would have been eligible for a rating of record pursuant to this chapter but for an administrative error shall be provided an extension to the evaluation period. The rating and payout procedures shall be in accordance with the requirements of this chapter and Volumes 2011-2012 of reference (e) to the maximum extent feasible. Such extension may not delay the effective date of the payout for either the individual employee or the pay pool.

12. CHALLENGING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD. This paragraph describes the Naval Intelligence reconsideration process for DCIPS evaluations of record. If after discussion with the rating and reviewing official, or in lieu of such discussion, the employee continues to disagree with the ratings, the employee may seek formal reconsideration of the rating by the EDDPs PM PRA. The administrative reconsideration process described is the exclusive formal process by which DCIPS employees may challenge their evaluation of record pursuant to this chapter. Employees may not challenge the content of performance objectives or elements, an individual performance objective rating, an individual performance element rating, rating or reviewing official comments, a midpoint review, or an interim assignment report of performance. Allegations that an

evaluation of record was based on prohibited considerations such as race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, physical or mental disability, or reprisal; on prohibited personnel practices; or on protections against whistleblower reprisal shall be processed through the Equal Employment Opportunity discrimination complaint procedure, Naval Intelligence administrative grievance processes, the DON Component Inspector General or Office of Special Counsel, if applicable, or other appropriate avenues rather than the reconsideration process.

12.1. Alternative Dispute Resolution. Alternative dispute resolution may be pursued at any time during the reconsideration process consistent with DON and Naval Intelligence policies and procedures.

12.2. Relationship to Compensation. In the event of a decision to adjust an evaluation of record, all compensation decisions that have been made with regard to the individual based on the adjusted evaluation of record must be reviewed for adjustment as appropriate. Any adjustments to compensation shall be retroactive to the effective date of the original compensation decision. Decisions made through this process shall not result in recalculation of the payout made to other employees in the pay pool.

12.3. Procedures for Informal Administrative Reconsideration

12.3.1. If an employee disagrees with the ratings on their performance evaluation, the employee should contact their rating and reviewing officials within 5 calendar days of the employee's receipt of their evaluation to resolve the disagreement informally.

12.3.2. The rating and/or reviewing officials are expected to issue a written decision within 5 calendar days upon receipt of the employee's reconsideration request.

12.3.3. All changes made to the performance evaluation of record based on an informal reconsideration must be reviewed and approved by the EDDP PM PRA.

12.3.4. If an employee disagrees with the results of the informal reconsideration decision or chooses to bypass the informal reconsideration phase, they may submit a formal request

for reconsideration to their EDDP PM PRA within 10 calendar days from receipt of their evaluation or receipt of the rating/reviewing official's decision of the informal reconsideration request, whichever occurs first.

12.4. Procedures for Formal Administrative Reconsideration

Request. If after using the informal reconsideration process, or in lieu of the informal process, the employee continues to disagree with the ratings, the employee may seek formal reconsideration of the rating by the EDDP PM PRA.

12.4.1. An employee seeking reconsideration of the evaluation of record must submit a written request for reconsideration to the EDDPs PM PRA with a copy to the rating official, the reviewing official (if different from the PM PRA), and the servicing HRO EMR office. The request for reconsideration must state the basis for the disagreement about the ratings and explain how any discussion with the rating and reviewing official has not resolved the matter.

12.4.1.1. An employee who has attempted to resolve the disagreement informally as described in subparagraph 12.3 of this chapter shall have 10 calendar days from the date he or she receives a decision from the rater and/or reviewing official about the disagreement to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

12.4.1.2. An employee who has not pursued an informal resolution of the evaluation of record disagreement shall have 10 calendar days from the receipt of the evaluation of record to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

12.4.2. An employee seeking administrative reconsideration may identify someone to act as his or her representative to assist in pursuing the reconsideration request. The employee representative may not have any conflict of interest with regard to the employee's request for reconsideration. The EDDPs PM PRA shall determine whether there is any potential conflict of interest that may affect the reconsideration process.

12.4.3. The request for formal reconsideration must be in writing and may include a request to personally address the EDDPs PM PRA. The request must include a copy of the evaluation of record being challenged, state what change is being requested, provide the employee's basis for requesting the

change and supporting documentation and the decision from the informal process.

12.4.4. Failure to comply with the procedures in this paragraph may result in the EDDPs PM PRA issuing a written cancellation of the reconsideration request. In this case, a copy of the cancellation shall be furnished to the servicing HRO EMR office, the employee's rating official, and the employee.

12.4.5. The EDDPs PM PRA shall review the request and confer with the rating official and reviewing official (when the reviewing official is not the PM PRA). He or she may conduct further inquiry as he or she deems appropriate. If the EDDPs PM PRA or a PRA panel member is the reviewing official, the member shall be excused from the process and the EDDPs Head shall decide on a replacement. Should the EDDPs PM PRA direct such an additional inquiry, the employee shall be offered the opportunity to review documentation and findings developed during the course of the further inquiry.

12.4.6. If the employee has requested an opportunity to personally address the EDDPs PM PRA which has approved the request, the EDDPs PM PRA shall set the date, time, location, and method of communication. To the extent practicable, such events shall be held during the scheduled working hours of the employee. If the EDDPs PM PRA is a governing board, they must address the entire board.

12.4.7. Within 15 calendar days of the EDDPs PM PRA's receipt of the employee's written request for reconsideration, the PM PRA must render a written decision. The EDDPs PM PRA may extend the deadline if necessary by another 15 calendar days. The decision must include a brief explanation of the basis for the decision, and notification that the employee may request further and final reconsideration of the decision by the Naval Intelligence PRA. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the servicing HRO EMR office, the rating official, the reviewing official (when the reviewing official is not the PM PRA) and the employee.

12.4.8. If an employee chooses to request further and final reconsideration of the evaluation of record, a request for reconsideration must be submitted to the Naval Intelligence PRA within 7 calendar days of receipt of the notice of the EDDPs PM

PRA decision. Within 15 calendar days of receipt of a request for further and final reconsideration, the Naval Intelligence PRA shall issue a final decision with a written explanation to the employee and servicing HRO EMR office unless he or she determines that further inquiry is required. In such cases, the NIAH shall advise the employee that a final decision shall be rendered on completion of the inquiry, but not later than 30 calendar days.

12.4.9. If the final decision is to change the evaluation of record, the corrected evaluation shall take the place of the original one. A revised evaluation of record shall be prepared and entered into all appropriate records and a copy shall be provided to the employee, servicing HRO EMR office, and the rating official. The revised evaluation of record shall be retroactive to the effective date of the original evaluation of record.

12.4.10. When calculating time limits under the administrative reconsideration procedure, the day of an action or receipt of a document is not counted. The last day of the time limit is counted unless it is a Saturday, Sunday, legal holiday, or a day on which the employee is not regularly scheduled to work. In those cases, the last day of the time limit shall be moved to the employee's next regularly scheduled workday. All time limits are counted in calendar days.

12.4.11. If the EDDPs PM PRA or Naval Intelligence PRA grants the employee's request for reconsideration after the annual bonus decision process, the employee's bonus decision shall be reconsidered and, if the change in rating so indicates, shall be changed to be consistent with the bonus decisions for other similarly situated employees within the employee's pay pool. The new bonus decision shall be made retroactive to the effective date of pay pool decisions that have been made within the employee's pay pool in accordance with Volume 2012 of Reference (e).

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

1. **OVERVIEW.** Individual performance objectives against which employees work are critical to linking the individual employee to the mission, goals, and objectives of an organization.

a. From the perspective of the organization, each individual performance objective assigned to an employee, if prepared thoughtfully, accomplishes one element of the organization's strategic goals and objectives. Taken in sum, the aggregate accomplishment of goals assigned to the organization's workforce, from the file clerk who ensures organizational records are properly accounted for and retrievable to the senior executive responsible for leadership of a major mission area, produce mission success for the organization.

b. From the perspective of the personnel management system, the performance objective as an element of the performance system provides the means by which the individual employee understands his or her role in the organization. It also provides the means by which the supervisor is able to observe, measure, and intercede as necessary as employees work against their individual and collective performance objectives. As accomplishments are aggregated upward through the organization, the collective accomplishments against all performance objectives provide organizational leaders with direct measures of the achievements of their organizations.

2. **THE SMART OBJECTIVE.**

a. For most supervisors and managers, providing employees with written performance objectives and a formal performance plan as part of the performance expectations discussion at the beginning of the evaluation period may seem to be a new requirement. Historically, however, supervisors generally have told employees orally what they were expected to do and achieve during the evaluation period. In some cases, this may have involved providing the employee a copy of his or her job description that laid out the duties of the position. In other cases, supervisors provided specific expectations such as production and quality

standards. Such expectations most often were used in jobs that involved repetitive processing such as voucher examining, insurance claims processing, or security adjudications.

b. For DCIPS employees, performance objectives are the most important element in the pay-decision process and also influence the promotion and assignment selection processes. Consequently, employees and managers must have confidence that performance objectives are written and evaluated in a manner that ensures equity and fairness within every organization and across all career groups.

c. DCIPS employees, managers, and oversight bodies shall judge both the quality and fairness of objectives in an employee's performance plan in terms of how each objective is structured in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4 of this guide.

3. WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR EMPLOYEES. For there to be a common understanding between the supervisor and employee on what the employee is expected to achieve during the performance evaluation period, individual employee objectives must be clearly identified.

a. **Performance Objectives are not Duty Statements.** A performance objective is significantly different from a duty statement in a position description. The duty statement sets boundaries within which an employee is expected to carry out his or her responsibilities. It is intentionally vague with regard to individual assignments because it is designed to provide a durable framework within which employees will be assigned work over time. For example, a duty statement might specify that an employee will "conduct substantive analyses of the economies of the Middle Eastern countries, providing written predictive analyses of leadership responses to existing or changing economic conditions within the region." Such a statement provides sufficient information to judge the experience and qualifications of the type of analyst who might hold the position. It also establishes the types of work assignments that the employee in the position should expect to be assigned. However, it does not provide specificity on the priorities of the organization or on the manner in which specific analytic assignments are to be selected, carried out, or assigned. It

also does not provide conditions under which the assignment shall be undertaken (as a member of a team, as leader of a team, as an individual contributor, or other conditions) or other details necessary to establish clear understanding of expectations between the supervisor and employee.

b. Performance Objectives are Specific. Performance objectives must be more specific than general duty statements. However, they should also be durable. Supervisors should strive to provide employees with three to six performance objectives for the evaluation period, with fewer generally being more effective. For example, an objective derived from the duty statement in the example in paragraph 3.a. of this guide would be sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand the expectations for one of his or her work products during the evaluation period. The restated objective might read: "The employee shall complete by August 31 an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community."

c. Performance Objectives are Measurable. Employees must be provided the criteria against which their accomplishments will be evaluated. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this guide, the work product has been described in terms sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand. However, the supervisor has not yet described the criteria against which the completed work product will be reviewed to determine the extent to which it is responsive to the requirement (i.e., whether the employee has achieved or exceeded expectations). The supervisor might expand on the objective above by stating: "To achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources; will reflect engagement with other analysts, customers, and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis; will have incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors throughout the IC; will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question; and will be timely." For an experienced employee, the standards outlined should be sufficient to establish the standard review methods that will be applied and any extraordinary expectations that may be added.

(1) During the planning discussion of the performance objective with the employee, it is appropriate that the supervisor discuss the specific relationship between the evaluation of the extent to which the employee has met or exceeded expectations on the objective and relevant performance elements. For example, in this critical thinking, communication and engagement and integration would all be significant in the achievement of the objective.

(2) Employees should be advised that the performance elements will be rated in their own right but will also affect the supervisor's rating official's judgment of the degree to which expectations have been met for the objective.

d. Performance Objectives are Achievable. All performance objectives should be appropriate to the experience, skill, and pay level of the employee. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this guide, the objective may be appropriate to a full-performance or senior analyst. Supervisors may refer to duties described in employee job descriptions or other documentation describing responsibilities for analysts, or in other employee occupational categories, as the basis for establishing the appropriate difficulty for a performance objective. The employee must also have access to the necessary resources to complete the work product. For example, the analyst assigned this objective would require access to the appropriate intelligence on the issue including translation support if applicable, other analysts working the issue, supervisory guidance and feedback as appropriate to his or her experience, and appropriate production support resources. During the performance-planning phase of the evaluation period, the supervisor and employee should establish the level of support necessary to ensure that the objective is achievable.

e. Performance Objectives are Relevant. To be relevant, DCIPS performance objectives must be derived from the NIS, Defense Intelligence Guidance, and the mission objectives of the employee's organization.

f. Performance Objectives are Timely or Time-Bounded. Performance objectives must specify the period during which the objective is expected to be achieved. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this guide, the period has been specified as

requiring completion and delivery of the work product by August 31 of the evaluation period.

4. WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS.

a. The underlying principles for writing objectives for supervisors and managers are the same as those for non-supervisory employees. However, the objectives themselves differ because the work products of the supervisor or manager are the work products of the unit, produced through the leadership of subordinate non-supervisory employees, increased workforce capability through supervisory development of subordinates and marshalling of the resources necessary to the success of the unit, and the strategic integration of the work unit into the broader Defense Intelligence and IC leadership activities.

b. Supervisory and managerial objectives are specific to the leadership roles of those holding these types of positions. The objectives for supervisors also differ from those of managers, with supervisors being more intimately involved in shaping individual work products in the unit and developing the skills of the subordinate workforce through individual interactions and coaching. At the managerial level, work activities are more focused on developing the leadership skills of subordinate supervisors, integrating the work of the unit into broader organizational contexts, and obtaining the resources (people, money, equipment) necessary to perform the mission of the work unit.

(1) Using the example for the individual analyst contributor developed in paragraph 3 of this guide, the complete SMART objective for the analyst would, following from the managers' objectives through the unit supervisor to the individual employee analyst, be: "The employee shall complete by August 31 an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community. To achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources, will reflect engagement with other analysts and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis, will have

incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors throughout the IC, will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question, and will be timely."

(2) For the manager of this unit, the objectives would follow from NIS Mission Objective #5.

(3) If the analyst in the example in subparagraph 4.b.(1) of this guide were located in a joint information operations center (JIOC) responsible for Middle Eastern intelligence operations, his or her objectives would follow from Defense Intelligence guidance and from the JIOC manager's objectives, which might include such leadership objectives as: "Develop and implement a strategy for accessing all-source intelligence relating to the JIOC area of operations, integrating the military and civilian workforce within the JIOC, and establishing JIOC objectives that will drive individual performance against the joint national and military intelligence mission, establish success measures against all JIOC objectives, and complete an initial assessment of progress against those measures by the end of the evaluation period."

(4) At the supervisory level, the employee's objectives would again follow from Defense Intelligence guidance but also from managerial objectives. For the supervisor of the analyst in the example in paragraph 3.a. of this guide, an objective might include such supervisory objectives as: "Develops the annual operating plan for the unit, developing and communicating specific performance objectives to all subordinate employees, establishing success measures for each objective, and conducting ongoing feedback throughout the evaluation period such that all organizational objectives are met, year-end performance feedback is provided to all subordinates in accordance with established guidelines, and reports of accomplishment are provided to JIOC management by the completion of the evaluation period."

APPENDIX B

QUICK REFERENCE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SPECIAL SITUATIONS

Situation	Naval Intelligence Guidance On Performance Management
<p>Naval Intelligence employees out on a Joint Duty Assignment (JDA)</p>	<p>Employees leaving on a JDA to another Intelligence Community (IC) component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With 90 days or less (generally after 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout - Early Annual Evaluation" from their Naval Intelligence rating official. They shall not receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their gaining element supervisor at the end of the performance cycle. • With more than 90 days (generally before 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout Performance Evaluation" from their Naval Intelligence rating official when they leave on their JDA and shall receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their gaining element rating official at the end of the performance cycle. <p>Employees returning from a JDA to Naval Intelligence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With 90 days or less (generally after 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout - Early Annual Evaluation" from their JDA IC component rating official. They shall not receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their Naval Intelligence supervisor at the end of the performance cycle. • With more than 90 days (generally before 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout Performance Evaluation" from their JDA IC component rating official when they return to Naval Intelligence and shall receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their Naval Intelligence rating official at the end of the performance cycle. <p>Note: The Naval Intelligence JDA program manager shall coordinate with the applicable IC component to verify who conducts the annual appraisal prior to the end of the performance period.</p>

<p>Other IC component employees on a JDA to Naval Intelligence</p>	<p>Employees detailed to Naval Intelligence on a JDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With 90 days or less (generally after 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout - Early Annual Evaluation" from their home element supervisor when they leave for their JDA. They shall not receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their Naval Intelligence rating official at the end of the performance cycle. • With more than 90 days (generally before 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout Performance Evaluation" from their home element rating official when they leave on their JDA and shall receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their Naval Intelligence rating official at the end of the performance cycle. <p>Employees on a JDA returning to an IC component from Naval Intelligence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With 90 days or less (generally after 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout - Early Annual Evaluation" from their Naval Intelligence supervisor when they return to their IC component from their JDA. They shall not receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their home IC component rating official at the end of the performance cycle. • With more than 90 days (generally before 1 July) remaining in the performance cycle, such employees shall receive a "Closeout Performance Evaluation" from their Naval Intelligence supervisor when they return to their home IC component from their JDA and shall receive an "Annual Appraisal" from their home IC component rating official at the end of the performance cycle. <p>Note: The Naval Intelligence JDA program manager shall coordinate with the applicable IC component to verify who conducts the annual appraisal prior to the end of the performance period.</p>
---	---

<p>Employees detailed to another organization (not on a JDA MOU)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closeout performance evaluations shall be completed for all employees detailed to another organization and on deployments for periods of 90 days or more. Such evaluations shall be completed by a supervisor or manager responsible for the employee's work while on detail or deployment. • The completed closeout evaluation shall be forwarded to the employee's rating official for consideration in preparation of the annual performance evaluation.
<p>Employees on Military Leave</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees who leave their positions, or return, during an evaluation period to serve a period of active uniformed military service, and who have completed at least 90 days under their performance plan, shall be entitled to a Closeout Performance Evaluation. • Employees who return to their positions following a period of uniformed military service who do NOT have the required 90 days of civilian service under a performance plan during the current evaluation period by the close of the evaluation period shall be awarded a presumptive rating of record. The presumptive rating shall be their last summary rating of record prior to departure for uniformed military service, but not less than a summary rating of "Successful" for the evaluation period that has closed. If a rating of record from a prior period is not available, the employee shall receive a summary rating of "Successful." *If the employee's last evaluation of record was less than "Successful," please consult with Employee Management Relations (EMR) for appropriate course of action. • All presumptive ratings will be documented in the PAA as a number rating and with a statement in the narrative section documenting the reason for the presumptive rating.
<p>Employees on Worker's Compensation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such employees shall be handled in accordance with the same procedures for employees on military leave (see above).

<p>Employees absent from their positions such that they have not performed under a DCIPS performance plan for a period of at least 90 days</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Long term training" is defined as an absence in excess of 120 consecutive work days or other special circumstance identified by the EDDP. Employees absent from their positions for job-related long-term training such that they have not been directly observed by their rating or reviewing official under a DCIPS performance plan for a period of at least 90 days shall be awarded a presumptive rating of record. The presumptive rating shall be their last summary rating of record prior to departure for training, but not less than a summary rating of "Successful" for the evaluation period that has closed. If a rating of record from a prior period is not available, the employee shall receive a summary rating of "Successful." *If the employee's last evaluation of record was less than "Successful," please consult with EMR for appropriate course of action. • All presumptive ratings will be documented in the PAA as a number rating and with a statement in the narrative section documenting the reason for the presumptive rating.
<p>Employees on Long Term Training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Long term training" is defined as an absence in excess of 120 consecutive work days or other special circumstance identified by the EDDP. Employees absent from their positions for job-related long-term training such that they have not been directly observed by their rating or reviewing official under a DCIPS performance plan for a period of at least 90 days shall be awarded a presumptive rating of record. The presumptive rating shall be their last summary rating of record prior to departure for training, but not less than a summary rating of "Successful" for the evaluation period that has closed. If a rating of record from a prior period is not available, the employee shall receive a summary rating of "Successful." *If the employee's last evaluation of record was less than "Successful," please consult with EMR for appropriate course of action. • All presumptive ratings will be documented in the PAA as a number rating and with a statement in the narrative section documenting the reason for the presumptive rating.

Retirement/ separation from a DCIPS position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the employee has been working under DCIPS for 90 days or more, a Closeout Performance Evaluation is required by the rating official. • If the employee has been working under DCIPS for 90 days or less, no action is needed and no Closeout Performance Evaluation is completed.
New DCIPS employees with less than 90 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New DCIPS employees who do not have 90 days under an approved performance plan by the end of the performance cycle are not rated on objectives or elements.
Employees from other DCIPS organizations or within Naval Intelligence who onboard with 90 days or less in the performance cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employee's "Closeout - Early Annual Evaluation" from the previous DoD IC component or Naval Intelligence entity shall be the annual Evaluation of Record. • All accomplishments made after the effective date of their performance plan through the end of the upcoming performance cycle will be included in the following year's Annual Appraisal; not to exceed 15 months.
Employees from other DCIPS organizations or within Naval Intelligence who onboard between 1 October and NAVINTEL PM PRA approval of ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employee's Annual Evaluation from the previous IC component shall be the annual Evaluation of Record and the employee will be considered in the gaining EDDP's pay pool. • These employees will be reported to NIA DCIPS Policy & Programs Office when applicable. • The EDDP must report these employees to NIA DCIPS Policy & Programs Office by email (DCIPS_RESOURCE_DESK@navy.mil) as soon as their Entry on Duty date is known.
Indefinite suspension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please contact Employee Management Relations for special instructions.

GLOSSARY

Unless otherwise noted, the following terms and their definitions apply to this chapter and serve as the basic performance management taxonomy for Entities with DON DCIPS Positions.

Closeout Performance Evaluation. A narrative description and numeric evaluation of an eligible employee's performance under an approved performance plan when there is a change in the rating official. The closeout performance evaluation is completed by the supervisor or rating official and conveys information regarding the employee's progress toward completion of performance objectives and performance against the performance elements. A closeout performance evaluation is not an evaluation of record, but shall be used to inform the rating official of employee accomplishments and/or needed improvement for the period covered by the evaluation. A closeout performance evaluation may become the final evaluation of record where the final evaluation of record cannot be completed.

Competencies. The measurable or observable knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and other characteristics needed to perform a type of work or function. These serve as the basis for common and IC component specific performance elements.

Day. The term "day" as used in this chapter refers to calendar days.

Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS).

Positions engaged in intelligence or intelligence-related work requiring a significant degree of specialized intelligence knowledge, skills and abilities, and those positions that serve in direct support of intelligence functions within a DON non-intelligence component, hereinafter referred to as "Entities with DON DCIPS Positions."

DoD Components. DoD Components are collectively referred to as OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the DoD, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other

entities within the Department of Defense that employ individuals under DCIPS.

Evaluation of Record or Final Rating Of Record. The summary performance rating, derived from the employee's ratings on his or her performance elements and performance objectives, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance that is used for official purposes, including decisions on bonuses as part of the DCIPS annual bonus decision process.

Evaluation Period. The annual period from creation of the employee performance plan through completion of the annual performance evaluation and evaluation of record. For DCIPS, the evaluation period covers the period from October 1 through September 30 each year. The effective date of the performance evaluation will be the date on which the reviewer approves the rating, but not later than November 15 each calendar year.

Individual Development Plan. A document prepared jointly by the supervisor and employee as part of the annual performance planning process that outlines development objectives for the employee. IDPs may include training, education, individual coaching, work assignment, or other activities designed to improve the employee's capability within his or her career field.

Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance. A narrative description of an employee's responsibilities and accomplishments prepared by a supervisor other than the rating official during an employee's interim or temporary assignment or deployment, generally for periods of 90 days or less.

Midpoint Review. A mandatory review of an employee's progress toward achieving the performance objectives and completed by the rating official (and employee) approximately midway through the performance evaluation period.

Pay Pool. A grouping of employees within the organization whose performance shall be assessed collectively and individually based on performance against individual and organizational objectives annually for distribution of funds allocated for performance-based pay outs.

Pay Pool Manager. Individual designated to manage the Pay Pool and ensure consistency in performance-based payouts.

Performance Element. A standard set of behaviors for all DCIPS positions, derived from analysis of the work being performed by employees that are necessary for successful performance of that work.

Performance Expectations. The aggregate view of what each employee is expected to accomplish in any given performance evaluation period; expectations are comprised of performance objective and performance elements as specifically defined in this chapter.

Performance Evaluation. The written or otherwise recorded evaluation of performance and accomplishments rated against DCIPS performance elements and objectives.

Performance Feedback. Management or supervisory communication with an employee throughout the evaluation period to provide feedback and convey employee performance levels and progress against the employee's performance plan.

Performance Management. The process of planning, setting, aligning, and communicating individual and organizational performance expectations to employees; monitoring and measuring their performance; providing feedback; taking appropriate steps to improve employee performance; addressing poor performance; and rating and rewarding employee performance to reflect the accomplishment of individual and organizational goals and objectives.

Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA). A senior employee or board within the chain of supervision of employees included in the rating and performance management processes for the organization, responsible for oversight of performance management processes. The PM PRA provides merit system oversight of the ratings under its purview, ensures compliance with merit principles, and resolves individual employee requests for reconsideration of ratings. Except where the PM PRA is the Head of the organization, the PM PRA should be at a level higher within the organizational hierarchy than the most senior reviewing official participating in the performance decision process. Where separation is not possible, the PM PRA shall be established as a senior employee or panel not in the chain of supervision for the performance evaluations under consideration.

Performance Objectives. Three to six SMART performance goals that relate individual job assignments or position responsibilities and/or accomplishments to performance elements and standards and to the mission, goals, and objectives of Naval Intelligence.

Performance Plan. All of the written or otherwise recorded performance elements, standards, and objectives against which the employee's performance is measured.

Performance Standards. Descriptors by performance element of "Successful" performance thresholds, requirements, or expectations for each career path and grade.

Rating Official. The official in an employee's chain of supervision/command, generally the first line supervisor, responsible for conducting performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and preparing the year-end evaluation of record on an employee.

Reviewing Official. An individual in the rating official's direct chain of supervision, normally the employee's second line supervisor, to assess supervisor's preliminary performance ratings for accuracy, consistency, and compliance with policy. The reviewing official is the approving official for each performance evaluation within his or her purview.

Work Level. General standards that define work in terms of increasing complexity, span of authority/responsibility, level of supervision (received or exercised), scope and impact of decisions, and work relationships, associated with a particular work category.